THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

THE BISHOPS' VIEW

AND

MR. LAURIER'S VIEW.

UNANIMOUS OPINION OF THE BISHOPS.

In order to put the electors in possession of the teaching of the archbishops and bishops of the provinces of Manitoba, Quebec, Ottawa and elsewhere on the duty of the Catholics at the present general election as to the Manitoba school question, it has been thought wise to publish on the one hand the view of the church, and on the other the view of Mr. Laurier, the leader of the Liberal party.

The Remedial Bill.

The Dominion Government, last session, submitted to Parliament a Bill with the aim of restoring to the Catholic minority of Manitoba the control of their schools, which was taken away from them in 1890 by the Protestant majority under the leadership of Messrs. Greenway and Martin.

Archbishop Langevin Approves of the Bill.

His Grace Mgr. Langevin, Archbishop of St. Boniface, and leader of the Catholic minority of Manitoba, in reply to a telegram as to the value and efficiency of the Bill, answered as follows:

(Telegram addressed to the Rev. Father Lacombe.)

"The Bill is applicable, efficacious and satisfactory. I approve of it. All the bishops and all true Catholics should approve of it. Our life is in the Bill.

ARCHBISHOP LANGEVIN."

(Another telegram addressed to Mr. Larivière, M.P. for Provencher.)

"Not one of the Bishops is at variance with me. All are extremely sympathetic. ***The Catholics who are fighting against the Bill are betraying the Catholic minority.***

"A. D. LANGEVIN.

"Archbishop of St. Boniface."

(Telegram addressed to Sir Charles Tupper near the end of the session.)

"In the name of the Catholic minority of Manitoba, whom I officially represent, I ask the House of Commons to adopt the Remedial Bill in its entirety, as it stands to-day amended. This measure will be satisfactory to the Catholic minority, who accept

1896
(39)

it as a substantial, practicable and final settlement of the question according to the Constitution

" A. D. LANGEVIN.

" Archbishop of St. Boniface."

After the session, on the 5th of May last, Mgr. Langevin again expressed his opinion on the Remedial Bill from the pulpit of the church of Joliette. He appealed to all Catholic electors to vote only for members who pledged themselves to do justice to the Manitoba minority. Here are his exact words:

.....

" You must understand that the people most interested in obtaining satisfactory legislation in this matter are the Catholic population of Manitoba and their archbishop, who now addresses you. *Since he approves of the Remedial Bill, you must conclude that before coming to that decision, he reflected long and carefully, and consulted* ***not*** *only his colleagues but distinguished judges, who gave him information on the constitutional questions involved. I approve of the Remedial Bill, not only in its principles, but in its entirety.* I conjure you to send to the House of Commons only such deputies as will make justice prevail and grant the Manitoba minority their rights with respect to education. I have no intention of going into politics, but this is a religious question which falls within my jurisdiction, and on which you ought to take my advice."

Mr. Laurier wishes to Kill the Bill.

On the 3rd of March, Sir Charles Tupper, by moving the second reading of the Remedial Bill, asked the House of Commons to adopt its principle.

Mr. Laurier, by his amendment, asked the House to reject the principle of the Bill, that is, the restoration of separate schools to the Catholic minority of Manitoba, and to put off the second reading of the Bill for six months. He wished in this way to strangle the Bill and kill it.

THE DIVISION.

The division on Mr. Laurier's amendment resulted as follows:—

FOR,—MESSRS.	FOR,—MESSRS.
Allan,	Henderson,
Bain,	Hodgins,
BECHARD,	Innes,
Beith,	Landerkin,
Bennett,	LANGELIER,
BERNIER,	LAURIER,
Borden,	LAVERGNE,
Boston,	LEDUC,
BOURASSA,	LEGRIS,
Bowers,	Lister,
Bowman,	Livingston,
BRODEUR,	Lowell,
BROWN,	Macdonald (Huron),
BRUNEAU,	Maclean (York),
Calvin,	McCARTHY,
Cameron (Huron),	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMillan,
CARROLL,	McMullen,
Carscallen,	McNeill,
Cartwright (Sir Rich),	McSHANE,
Casey,	MARTIN,
CHARBONNEAU,	MIGNEAULT,
Charlton,	Mills (Bothwell),
CHOQUETTE,	MONET,
CHRISTIE,	Mulock,
Cockburn,	O'BRIEN,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Craig,	Perry,
Davies,	PREFONTAINE,
Dawson,	PROULX,
Edgar,	RIDER,
EDWARDS,	RINFRET,
FAUVEL,	Rosamond,
Featherston,	SANBORN,
Flint,	SCRIVER,
Forbes,	Semple,
Fraser,	Somerville,
GEOFFRION,	Sproule,
Gibson,	Stubbs,
Gilmor,	Sutherland,
GODBOUT,	TARTE,
Grieve,	Tyrwhitt,
GUAY,	WALLACE,
HARWOOD,	Weldon,

Welsh,
Wilson,

Yeo.—91.

AGAINST,—MESSRS.	AGAINST,—MESSRS.
Amyot,	Lachapelle,
Angers,	Langevin (Sir Hector)
Baird,	LaRiviere,
Barnard,	Leclair,
Beausoleil,	Lépine,
Belley,	Lippé,
Bergeron,	Macdonald (King's),
Bergin,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Blanchard,	Macdowall,
Boyd,	McAlister,
Boyle,	McDonald Assiniboia
Burnham,	McDonald, (Victoria)
Cameron (Inverness)	McDougald (Pictou),
Cargill,	McDougall, C Breton
Carignan,	McGillivray,
Carling (Sir John),	McGreevy,
Carpenter,	McInerney,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McIsaac,
Chesley.	McKay,
Cleveland,	McLean (King's),
Coastworth,	McLennan,
Cochrane,	McLeod,
Corbould,	Mara,
Costigan,	Marshall,
Daly,	Masson,
Davin,	Metcalfe,
Davis,	Miller,
Delisle.	Mills (Annapolis),
Desaulniers,	Moncrieff,
Devlin,	Northrup,
Dickey,	Ouimet,
Dugas,	Patterson Colchester
Dupont,	Pelletier,
Dyer,	Pope,
Earle,	Powell,
Fairbairn,	Pridham,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)	Prior,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Putnam,
Foster,	Reid,
Fréchette,	Robillard,
Fremont,	Robinson,
Gillies,	Roome,
Girouard,	Ross (Dundas),
Grandbois,	Ross (Lisgar),
Grant (Sir James),	Ryckman,
Guillet,	Smith (Ontario),
Haggart,	Stairs,
Haslam,	Stevenson,
Hazen,	Taylor,
Hughes,	Temple,
Hutchins,	Tisdale,
Ingram,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Ives,	Tupper (Sir Chas. H.)
Jeannotte,	Turcotte,
Joncas,	Vaillancourt,
Kaulbach,	White (Shelburne),
Kenny,	Wilmot,
	Wood.—115.

The motion of Sir Charles Tupper was then adopted on the following division:—

FOR,—MESSRS.	FOR,—MESSRS.
Amyot,	Lachapelle,
Angers,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Baird,	LaRiviere,
Barnard,	Leclair,
Beausoleil,	Lépine,
Belley,	Lippé,
Bergeron,	Macdonald (King's)
Bergin,	Macdonell (Algoma)
Blanchard,	Macdowall,
Boyd,	McAlister,
Boyle,	McDonald Assiniboia
Burnham,	McDonald (Victoria),
Cameron (Inverness),	McDougald (Pictou),
Cargill,	McDougall (C. Breton)
Carignan	McGreevy,
Carling (Sir John),	McInerney,
Carpenter,	McIsaac,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McKay,
Chesley,	McLean (King's),
Cleveland,	McLennan,
Coatsworth,	McLeod,
Cochrane,	Mara,
Corbould,	Marshall,
Costigan,	Masson,
Daly,	Metcalfe,
Davin,	Miller,
Davis,	Mills (Annapolis),
Delisle,	Moncrieff,
Desaulniers,	Devlin,
Dickey,	Patterson Colchester
Dugas,	Pelletier,
Dupont,	Pope,
Dyer,	Powell,
Earle,	Pridham,
Fairbairn,	Prior,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.)	Putnam,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Reid,
Foster,	Robillard,
Fréchette,	Robinson,
Frémont,	Roome,
Gillies,	Ross (Lisgar),
Girouard,	Ryckman,
Grandbois,	Smith (Ontario),
Grant (Sir James)	Stairs,
Guillet,	Stevenson,
Haggart,	Taylor,
Haslam,	Temple,
Hazen,	Tisdale,
Hutchins,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Ingram,	Tupper (Sir Chas. H.)
Iver,	Turcotte,
Jeannotte,	Vaillancourt,
Joncas,	White (Shelburne),
Kaulbach,	Wilmot,
Kenny,	Wood.—112.

AGAINST,—MESSRS.	AGAINST,—MESSRS.
Allan,	Innes,
Bain,	Landerkin,
BECHARD,	LANGELIER,
Beith,	LAURIER,
Bennett,	LAVERGNE,
BERNIER,	DEDUC,
Borden,	LEGRIS,
Boston,	Lister,
BOURASSA,	Livingston,
Bowers,	Lowell,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron)
BRODEUR,	Maclean (York)
BROWN,	McCARTHY,
BRUNEAU,	McGillivray,
Calvin,	McGregor,
Cameron (Huron),	McMillan,
Campbell,	McMullen,
CARROLL,	McNeil,
Carscallen,	McSHANE,
Cartwright (Sir Rich)	MARTIN,
Casey,	MIGNAULT,
CHARBONNEAU,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	MONET,
CHOQUETTE,	Mulock,
Christie,	O BRIEN,
Cockburn,	Paterson (Brant),
Colter,	Perry,
Craig,	PREFONTAINE,
Davies,	PROULX,
Dawson,	RIDER,
Edgar,	RINFRET,
EDWARDS,	Rosamond,
FAUVEL,	Ross (Dundas),
Featherston,	SANBORN,
Flint,	SCRIVER,
Forbes,	Semple,
Fraser,	Somerville,
GEOFFRION,	Sproule,
Gibson,	Stubbs,
Gilmor,	Sutherland,
GODBOUT,	TARTE,
Grieve,	Tyrwhitt,
GUAY,	WALLACE,
HARWOOD,	Weldon,
Henderson,	Welsh,
Hodgins,	Wilson,
Hughes,	Yeo.—94.

Episcopal Intervention in the School Question.

Under this heading the "Courrier du Canada" publishes an important article which is reproduced here in full:—On Wednesday, Feb. 12th, the *Electeur* published, in connection with the last electoral contest in Charlevoix, a carefully elaborated article, written in a learned and sententious style, tending to deny the Canadian Episcopate all right of intervention in the matter of remedial legislation with respect to the Manitoba school question.

We have read, and, like many others, not without a feeling of surprise, the thesis developed in the columns of the *Electeur* by a theologian whom the editor in his issue of the 14th, is pleased to call one of the most eminent of the ecclesiastical province of Quebec. This thesis, which is (let us hasten to say) contrary to the rights of the Bishops and allied, no doubt, without the knowledge of its author, to the principles of Catholic Liberalism, is false, pernicious, and to be absolutely condemned.

To meet the wishes of the ecclesiastical authority of this diocese, and with his formal approval, we will say a few words about the rash doctrines put forth on the article of the Liberal journal, and will make it evident wherein the argument of the writer of that article offends.

First of all, let it be understood, we divest ourselves of every purely political consideration or prejudice, for this is not a question of party interests, but of ecclesiastical doctrine and public rights of the highest religious and national bearing.

In the second place, we wish to defend against all opposition the legal and moral right as well as the opportuneness of intervention in the very conditions in which it took place at Charlevoix, that is to say, supposing that the Remedial Bill submitted by the Government is of such a character as to merit the support of the Bishops.

It would be in vain to attempt to stay a tottering argument by alleg-

ing defects in the Remedial Bill. This would be only a subterfuge.

This point established, let us approach the chief argument on which rests the doctrine dear to the *Electeur* and to its correspondent, but less dear to those whom the Holy Spirit has entrusted with the guardianship of the flock of Jesus Christ and the government of the Christian community.

According to the correspondent of the *Electeur*, although the Church has the right to ask that the Manitoba school question be settled according to the principles of justice, it has, however, no right to determine or approve of the means suggested by one or other political party as to how the question should be settled. We deny this assertion, for the following reasons :—

The Church being by reason of its aims a society essentially superior to the State, the State is subordinate to it in everything which affects religious interests. This is a clear and certain principle. Therefore, it must be recognized that the Church has real jurisdiction over the secular power even upon questions of the temporal order, provided, however, that these matters have a connection of necessity or of real utility with the aims of the religious community. This is the teaching of Leo XIII formulated in the following proposition which we extract from the Encyclical *Immortale Dei*: "Everything which is sacred in whatever respect, everything which affects the salvation of souls and the worship of God, either by its nature, or by relation to its 'end,' is amenable to the authority of the Church."

Therefore, although two political means being given equally apt to favor in their full extent the interests of the Church, the Church would have no reason to make a choice; the case is quite different when one of these means, in the unanimous judgment of the leading bishops of the country and even according to the nature of things, offers guarantees of efficacity and stability which the other could not offer. In this case, in fact, the Church, whose interests surpass all political rights, considerations and aspirations whatever, can and ought to exercise its jurisdiction as to the means to be taken, as to the way to be followed to arrive at the desired end; not to do so would be to gravely compromise the cause the Church defends.

In doing so the Church rests within her own sphere; for the means chosen by the Church, though political and temporal in its nature, nevertheless puts on, "by reason of its destination" and its relative superiority, a religious and exceptional character, which perfectly justifies the attention of the ecclesiastical authority.

This is the present case.

Our spiritual leaders, after waiting five years with poignant anxiety for the settlement of so important and so vital a question from the Catholic point of view, judge, and rightly, that it would be imprudent to renounce the benefit of a decision given in favor of their cause by the highest tribunal of the Empire, and again put in question rights so openly recognized. They judge, and rightly, that it would be rash, in a matter so grave, to confide their hopes to a commission of inquiry, which would inevitably cause further delay, and which, doing away with the Dominion interference, to which the promoters of the commission are op-

posed, would place the Catholics once more at the mercy of their persecutors.

For, supposing even—and it may well be doubted—that the Manitoba Government, fundamentally hostile to the Catholics and confirmed in that hostility by its recent victory at the polls, would consent,at the suggestion of its political friends, to re-establish the system of separate schools which our co-religionists enjoyed before 1890, who will assure us that the same government or some other, influenced by the same motives of fanaticism or self-interest, would not, sooner or later, again wage on this school question the violent and unjust war that we deplore to-day? Would it not be much better for the central power, seeing that it has the right and the opportunity of doing so, to raise forthwith against all persecutors, present and future, a rampart of justice and religious protection, which will resist all winds and storms?

I will add that in view of the party spirit which divides so profoundly our public men, one particular political group cannot be expected to provide the strength necessary to rally all Catholics to the same idea and under the same flag.

The Episcopate alone can hope to bring this about by asking our legislators, especially those whose consciences they direct, to rise for a moment above the temporal interests which engage their attention, to forget their political dissensions, and, relying upon the judgment of the Privy Council, to make it the unassailable foundation of truly remedial legislation.

The Bishops' right of interference in a matter of this nature is, besides, clearly deduced from the teaching contained in the "Manual of the Catholic Citizen", published with the special recommendation of their Lordships the Bishops of the Province of Quebec. On page 27 we read: "In consequence of the dependence of Christian princes upon the Church, the Church has the power to regulate the use which princes ought to make, in certain cases, of their temporal power; for it must be held for certain, according to the teaching of the theologians, that the power of the keys given by Jesus Christ to Peter and in his person to his successors (Matthew XVI, 19) includes the right of regulating the use that Christian princes ought to make of their temporal power in its relations with religion and the salvation of souls, and on various occasions 'to submit their political acts to the judgment of the Church.'"

Finally, the eminent theologian we are opposing ought to know that the following proposition: "It belongs to the civil power to define what are the rights of the Church, and the limits within which it can exercise them" has been justly condemned in the Syllabus. It is indeed to the Church and to its representatives, not to others, that it belongs in case of doubt to determine how far the ecclesiastical or episcopal jurisdiction ought to extend. For this reason Mgr. Cavagnis, in his work entitled: "Ideas of public right, natural and ecclesiastical," establishes with certainty this proposition: "The Church authoritatively determines what is or is not in its competence, and the State ought to respect the decision." He had previously said: "In the conflict between the

spiritual and the temporal, the former ought to prevail."

The distinguished correspondent of the *Electeur*, judging his thesis ill-supported, feels the need of strengthening it by a circular of Mgr. Taschereau, written in 1872 with respect to the New Brunswick schools, in which the Archbishop of Quebec declares the Catholics free to choose the means which they consider the most apt to attain the desired end, that is to say, to remedy the school system of New Brunswick

But we deny the parallel between this case and that of the Manitoba schools. In 1872 the Catholics had no constitutional act or judicial decision in their favor, which would give to the advisers of the Episcopate a legal foundation and definitely assure the assertion of the rights violated. To-day, not only does the Manitoba Act contain a clause favorable to the rights of the minority, but the highest judicial authority of the British Empire has solemnly sanctioned these rights and traced out for the Dominion Government the way to follow. Could the Bishops, without betraying the Catholic cause, refuse to use a weapon which Providence puts so opportunely in their hands?

The correspondent of the *Electeur* also refers to the intervention of the Pope in the political affairs of Germany and France, and draws from these facts a conclusion by no means warranted by the premises. Nothing more stupid could be imagined. The interference of the Sovereign Pontiff on these two occasions was either a command or simply a piece of advice. In the first case there would have been grave disobedience on the part of the refractory Catholics; in the second, a culpable lack of deference. In either case, it is clear that the Pope judged it appropriate to give Catholics, even in political affairs, directions influenced by the religious interests of which he has charge. Therefore, the religious power can sometimes interfere in matters of this sort.

It is for him to judge whether intervention ought to be in the form of command or advice and when this intervention takes the imperative form, as in the case of the Manitoba schools, the faithful have only one course open to them: to obey.

The obedient man, the Scriptures say, will go from victory to victory: "*Vir obediens loquetur victorias.*" It is obedience, and not insubordination, which saves peoples as well as individuals. We sincerely hope that all Canadian Catholics, whatever may be their political flag, will understand this doctrine and will not give to the church and the world the sad spectacle of a deplorable division just where union, under the enlightened direction of the Episcopate and with the help of the right-thinking Protestants of this country, is necessary for the triumph of justice and the maintenance of religious peace in the Canadian confederation.

L. A. PAQUET, Priest.

Two Views.

On the 16th of May the Archbishops and Bishops of the Province of Quebec published a collective mandement which will be given later. Just now we detach the following passage to contrast it with the view of Mr. Laurier, who teaches the contrary.

The Church's View.

Remark, dearly beloved brethren, that a Catholic is not permitted, in whatever position he may be,—a journalist, an elector, a candidate or a representative, to have two lines of conduct in religious questions, one for private, and the other for public life, to trample under foot, in the exercise of his social duties, the obligations imposed on him as a submissive child of the Church. This is why our Holy Father Pope Leo XIII., in his Encyclical *praestantissimum* condemns those who "pretend that in all that concerns the government of human society, its institutions, morals, laws, public functions, the instruction of youth, no more attention is to be paid to the Church than if she did not exist." For the same reason he says elsewhere (Encyclical *Immortale Dei*): "*Before all it is necessary that all Catholics worthy of the name, determine to be, and show themselves devoted sons of the Church; that they repulse, without hesitation, all that would be incompatible with this profession; that they make use of public institutions as far as they can, in conscience, for the furtherance of truth and justice.*" (Mandement of the Bishops of the ecclesiastical provinces of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa, dated May 16th, 1896.)

Mr. Laurier's View.

I am a Liberal of the English school. I believe in that school, which has all along claimed that it is the privilege of all subjects, whether high or low, whether rich or poor, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, to participate in the administration of public affairs, to discuss, to influence, to persuade, to convince, but which has always denied even to the highest the right to dictate even to the lowest. I am here representing not Roman Catholics alone but Protestants as well, and I must give an account of my stewardship to all classes. Here am I, a Roman Catholic of French extraction entrusted by the confidence of the men who sit around me with great and important duties under our constitutional system of government. I am here the acknowledged leader of a great party composed of Roman Catholics and Protestants as well, in which Protestants are in the majority, as Protestants must be in the majority in every part of Canada. Am I to be told, I, occupying such a position, that I am to be dictated the course I am to take in this House, by reasons that can appeal to the consciences of my fellow-Catholic members, but which do not appeal as well to the consciences of my Protestant colleagues? No. So long as I have a seat in this House, so long as I occupy the position I do now, whenever it shall become my duty to take a stand upon any question whatever, that stand I will take not upon grounds of Roman Catholicism, not upon grounds of Protestantism, but upon grounds that can appeal to the consciences of all men, irrespective of their particular faith, upon grounds which can be occupied by all men who love justice, freedom and toleration. — (Mr. Laurier's speech in the House of Commons on the 3rd of March, 1896. Extract from "Hansard.")

The following is the full text of the collective pastoral letter:

PASTORAL LETTER

of their Lordships the Archbishops and Bishops of the ecclesiastical provinces of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa on the Manitoba School Question:

We, by the grace of God and favor of the Apostolic See, Archbishops and Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Provinces of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa,

To the Secular and Regular Clergy, and to all the faithful of our respective dioceses, health and benediction in our Lord.

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN,—Called by the will of our Divine Lord to the spiritual government of the particular churches confided to their care, the Bishops, successors of the Apostles, have not only the mission to teach truth at all times and to infuse salutary principles into the souls of men, but they have, moreover, in certain critical and perilous circumstances, the right, and it is their duty, to raise their voices to forewarn the faithful of dangers that threaten their faith, and to direct, stimulate and sustain them in the just revindication of their imprescriptible rights, manifestly disregarded and violated.

You know, dearly beloved brethren, the very painful position in which our co-religionists of Manitoba have been placed by the unjust laws which deprived them, six years ago, of the separate school system, which, in virtue of the Constitution of the country, they enjoyed till then—a school system so important, so necessary for a mixed population, for a healthy education and for the formation of children in the principles of the Catholic faith, which is, on earth, our greatest treasure and most precious inheritance.

We stood not in need of the decisions of civil tribunals, dearly beloved brethren, to see the injustice of these Manitoban laws, these attacks on liberty and justice; still, it has pleased Divine Providence, in His wisdom and goodness, to obtain for Catholics the legal support of an unexceptional and sovereign authority in the recognition by the highest tribunal of the Empire, the legitimacy of their griefs and the legality of a Federal remedial measure.

In view of these facts, the Canadian Episcopate, solicitous above all for the interest of religion and the good of souls, could not dissimulate the gravity of the duty which was imposed on their pastoral solicitude, and which obliged them to claim justice as they have done.

For, since the Bishops, whose authority is from God himself, are the natural judges of questions concerning Christian faith, religion and morals; since they are the recognized heads of a perfect society, sovereign and superior by its nature and its end to civil society, it belongs to them, when circumstances require it, not only to express uniquivocally their views and their desires in every religious matter, but to point out to the faithful, or approve of suitable means to arrive at the spiritual end they have in view. This is the doctrine of the great Pope Leo XIII. in his Encyclical *immortale Dei*:—"All that is sacred in human affairs, under any title whatever, all that regards the end in view, all such falls under the jurisdiction and authority of the Church."

We deem it of importance, dearly beloved brethren, to remind you

briefly of these inherent principles in the constitution of the Church itself, those essential rights of religious authority, in order to justify the attitude taken by the members of the Catholic Hierarchy in the present school question, and to explain more fully the obligations under which the faithful are of following episcopal directions.

If there are, in fact, circumstances in which Catholics ought to manifest openly towards the Church all the respect and devotedness to which she is entitled, it is surely in a crisis such as the present, when the highest interests of faith and justice are at stake, demanding on the part of all good men a united and firm front under the direction of their leaders.

We had hopes, dearly beloved brethren, that the last session of the Federal Parliament would bring to a termination the school difficulties which so widely divide men's minds; we have been deceived in these hopes. History itself will judge of the causes which impeded the long expected solution.

As for us who have in view only the triumph of the eternal principles of religion and justice confided to our care, we, whom no defeat will ever be able to dishearten or turn aside from the accomplishment of the divine mission which was that of the Apostles themselves, feel, in the presence of the electoral struggle about to take place, that an imperative duty is incumbent on us: this duty is to indicate to all the faithful under our jurisdiction, and whose consciences we have to direct, the only line of conduct to be followed in the present elections.

Should we, first of all, remind you, dearly beloved brethren, how noble and important is the right bestowed upon you by the Constitution in designating for office the depositaries of public power? Every citizen worthy of the name, every Canadian who loves his country, who wishes it to be great, peaceful and prosperous, should interest himself in its government.

Now, the government of our country, of a people still young, but capable of occupying a distinguished place among the nations, will be what you will make it yourselves by your choice and by your votes.

That is to say, dearly beloved brethren, as a general rule, and save rare exceptions, it is a duty of conscience for every citizen to vote; a duty all the more grave and pressing as the questions disputed are important and may exercise over your destinies an influence more or less decisive.

That is to say, again, you should vote as honest, wise, enlightened and intelligent Christians.

Avoid then, dearly beloved brethren, deplorable excesses against which we frequently warned you; perjury, intemperance, lying, calumny, violence and party spirit, which warp the judgment and produce a kind of voluntary obstinate blindness.

Do not sell your vote. To vote is a duty, and duty is not sold. Give not your vote to the first comer, but to him whom in conscience you judge the best qualified by his mental powers, firmness of character and his moral principles to fill the noble office of legislator.

And that this judgment may be surer, and more enlightened, fear not the criticisms of a newspaper or the opinions of a friend who would hamper your mind; consult when

necessary, before voting, persons who by their instruction, their rank or their social standing are the best qualified to judge of the questions that are agitated, and to appreciate the relative value of the candidates who ask your suffrage.

These are, dearly beloved brethren, general principles of wisdom and Christian prudence that apply to all times and to all elections in which the laws of the country permit you to take part.

But, in the present circumstances, the duty of Canadian electors, principally Catholic electors, is invested with a character of special importance, to whose gravity we desire to call your attention in a special manner. A grave injustice was committed against the Catholic minority in Manitoba.

They were deprived of their Catholic separate schools, and forced to send their children to schools that their consciences condemn. The Privy Council of England recognized the justice of the Catholic claim, and the right of the Federal authorities to interfere, in order that justice be done to the oppressed. It is a question, then, for the Catholics of our country and well meaning Protestants to unite their strength and their suffrages, to secure a final victory for religious liberty and the triumph of the rights secured by the Constitution. The means to secure this end is to elect, as representatives of the people, only men sincerely resolved to favor with all their influence and to sustain in Parliament a measure to remedy the evils from which the Manitoban minority suffers. In speaking to you thus, dearly beloved brethren, our intention is not to bind ourselves to any of the parties that are combating in the political arena; on the contrary, we desire to preserve our liberty. The Manitoba school question being, before all, a religious question, intimately allied to the dearest interests of the Catholic faith in this country, to the natural rights of parents, and also to the respect due to the Constitution of the country and to the British crown, we would regard it as betraying a sacred cause, of which we are, and ought to be, the defenders, if we did not use our authority to secure its success.

Remark, dearly beloved brethren, that a Catholic is not permitted, in whatever position he may be,—a journalist, an elector, a candidate or a representative, to have two lines of conduct in religious questions, one for private, and the other for public life, to trample under foot, in the exercise of his social duties, the obligations imposed on him as a submissive child of the Church. This is why our Holy Father Pope Leo XIII. in his Encyclical *Libertas præstantissimum* condemns those who "pretend that in all that concerns the government of human society, its institutions, morals, laws, public functions, the instruction of youth, no more attention is to be paid to the Church than if she did not exist. For the same reason he says elsewhere (Encyclical *Immortale Dei*): "Before all it is necessary that all Catholics, worthy of the name, determine to be, and show themselves devoted sons of the Church; that they repulse, without hesitation, all that would be incompatible with this profession; that they make use of public institutions as far as they can, in conscience, for the furtherance of truth and justice."

Therefore, dearly beloved brethren, all Catholics should support only those candidates who bind themselves formally and solemnly to vote, in Parliament, in favor of legislation which will restore to the Catholic minority of Manitoba the school rights to which they are entitled by the decision of the Hon. Privy Council of England. This grave duty is incumbent on every good Catholic, and you would not be justified, either before your spiritual guides, nor before God himself, by neglecting this obligation.

Until now we could congratulate ourselves on having the sympathetic support of a great number of our separated brethren who understood that, in a country such as ours, having different religions, it is necessary for the general good to make use of this broadness of view which respects liberty of conscience and acquired right. We appeal again to their spirit of justice and patroitism, so that, joining their influence to that of Catholics they may aid them to redress and grievances of which our co-religionists so justly complain.

What we want is the triumph of right and justice, the re-establishment of the rights and privileges of our Manitoba brethren, the Roman Catholic minority, in educational matters so as to shelter them from arbitrary and unjust legislation.

We rely in this matter, dearly beloved brethren, on your spirit of faith and obedience.

We are convinced that, submissive in mind and heart to the teaching of your chief pastors, you will know how, if called upon, to place above your personal opinions and feelings the interests of a cause which excels all others—that of justice, order and harmony in the different classes which compose the great Canadian family.

Done and signed at Montreal, on the sixth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and ninety six.

† EDWARD CHARLES, Archbishop of Montreal.
† J. THOMAS, Archbishop of Ottawa.
† L. N., Archbishop of Cyrene, Administrator of Quebec.
† L. F., Bishop of Three Rivers.
† L. N., Bishop of St. Hyacinthe.
† N. ZEPHIRIN, Bishop of Cythere, Vicar Apostolic of Pontiac.
† ELPHEGE, Bishop of Nicolet.
† ANDRE ALBERT, Bishop of St. Germain of Rimouski.
† MICHAEL THOMAS, Bishop of Chicoutimi.
† JOSEPH MEDARD, Bishop of Valleyfield.
† PAUL, Bishop of Sherbrooke.
† MAX., Bishop of Druzipara, Coadjutor to the Bishop of St. Hyacinthe.

By order of their Lordships.

ALFRED ARCHAMBEAULT,
Chancellor.

Extract from the Circular Letter of the Archbishops and Bishops to the Clergy of their Dioceses.

"We ask, and we have the right to do so, that every member of the clergy, who on the day of his ordination has promised respect and obedience to his Bishop, should *have only one heart and one voice to claim with us the remedy to the grievances of the minority of Manitoba by the means recommended by the Episcopate, that is to say by a* REMEDIAL BILL."

"Nothing is more appropriate to the existing circumstances than those wise words of our Sovereign Pontiff, Leo XIII:—'The authority of the Bishops must be sacred to the clergy, and they must know that their ministry, if not exercised under the direction of the Bishops, will not be either holy, fully useful or honored.'

"Our enemies desire nothing so much as dissension among the Catholics. Catholics ought therefore to understand how important it is for them to avoid dissension, and remember the saying of our Lord: A kingdom divided against itself will be brought to desolation. If, to preserve union, it is sometimes necessary to give up our feelings and private judgment, we ought to do it willingly in view of the common good. (Encyclical *Nobilissima Gallorum gens*).

"Consequently, dear brethren, we instantly pray you, and we even command you, not to say anything that could be against the teaching of the Episcopate; but, on the contrary, when you will be consulted, answer according to the meaning and desire of those appointed by God to govern the religious society, and who work in a common spirit for the triumph of faith, justice and social order.

"To the prudence and submission which are demanded of you, do not fail to add prayer, to ask God to enlighten all those who will take part in the approaching election: the candidates, the electors, and the officers appointed to secure the observance of the law, in order that, with the blessing of God, the result may tend to the greatest spiritual and temporal good of our dear fatherland."

† EDOUARD CHAS., Archbishop of Montreal.
† J. THOMAS, Archbishop of Ottawa.
† L. N., Archbishop of Cyrene, Administrator of Quebec.
† L. F., Bishop of Three Rivers.
† N. ZEPHIRIN, Bishop of Cythere, Vicar Apostolic of Pontiac.
† ELPHEGE, Bishop of Nicolet.
† ANDRE-ALBERT, Bishop of St. Germain de Rimouski.
† MICHEL THOMAS, Bishop of Chicoutimi.
† JOSEPH MEDARD, Bishop of Valleyfield.
† PAUL, Bishop of Sherbrooke.
† MAX., Bishop of Druzipara, Coadjutor to the Bishop of St. Hyacinthe.

MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

The Bishops are Unanimous.

Sermon of the Archbishop of St. Boniface at Laprairie.

People interested in exploiting public opinion for their own advantage have made a great fuss about a sermon delivered by Archbishop Langevin on the 12th of May last at Laprairie. They attempt to throw discredit on the learned Bishop by accusing him of conducting a political propaganda to their detriment, although His Grace simply contented himself with informing his brethren and friends of his native village (St. Isidore) and a neighboring parish (Laprairie) of the sad position of his dear flock, whose official interpreter and born defender he is.

The Liberals complain that in the performance of his duty, with all the

discretion and authority that his office confers upon him, Mgr. Langevin happened in dividing the responsibilities and the deserts of the matter, to hurt the susceptibilities of the promoters of the Laurier programme. These good people have only themselves to blame and the notorious errors of judgment of which they have been guilty, to say the least of it, on this important question.

Honour to whom honour is due, blame for infamy and the cowardice of traitors, nothing else is to be gathered from the words of the reverend metropolitan of the West, and those who seek to give the impression that his words or his acts aim at compromising the political interests of one party, and promoting those of the other, know that they lie, that they knowingly utter calumnies.

In order that our readers may convince themselves of the truth, of the calmness and impartiality of the remarks of Mgr. Langevin, we will place before them the full text of the sermon delivered at Laprairie by the distinguished prelate. We take the report of the *Presse*, officially approved as correct, with some slight alterations :—

"My Very Dear Brethren,—It is a great pleasure to me to be this evening in this magnificent church, in the midst of a population not altogether strange to me, for if I love to pronounce the name of my native parish, if I am proud to call myself a son of St. Isidore, I love also to speak of myself as of Laprairie, and you know why I have accepted the invitation to come and address you.

"I would not have done it in another place, but it seemed to me that you have rights, and that I have rights, too, under the circumstances. A son of St. Isidore is at home at Laprairie.

"I thank you for the sympathy you have shown me by attending in such large numbers. I remember, with delight, the blessed hours of joy and felicity which I have spent with you in my youth. I have kept a remembrance of it whose perfume accompanies me everywhere. Now it happens that we are in extremely difficult circumstances. Some would consider it strange that a bishop should speak upon such a question—a question which was being made a political balloon, to be thrown from one political party to another—but I would tell you that it is not strange, since in this lamentable state of affairs you are liable to be led away by false representations and false versions. Why, then, should you not hear the true version from the lips of the official representative of the oppressed Catholic minority of Manitoba. Why should I not tell you what the Manitoba minority and the country expect of you?

"I am a bishop before all. God forbid that I should ever descend into the political arena. I do not forget that political parties pass, change and disappear.

"Politicians disappear, but right and justice are eternal as God himself and will not pass away.

"It is not in the name of any political party that I come to you, and what I would say I do not speak at the request of any group of men. Neither am I led by any vile interests, in spite of insinuations of the kind. Justice and truth can never be sold. It is in the name of your persecuted, down-trodden brethren of Manitoba that I speak to you.

"I will be short and limit my ob-

servations to two main points. After being deprived of their schools for six long years, the minority at last heard with joy that a Federal law would be passed to re-establish the schools which had been taken away from them. I will tell you now what I think of this Remedial Bill which has been introduced into the Dominion Parliament by the Government. The bill was first a consecration of the principle of separate schools, and, secondly, of Federal intervention.

"It consecrated the principle of separate schools, since it revived, brought back to life and even from the grave, where they had been buried, the Catholic schools of Manitoba. The bill gave them a Separate School Board, the control of the teachers' certificates, the control of the school books, the creation of school districts and the appointment of inspectors; the creation of a Catholic normal school, and the right to tax themselves for the maintenance of their own separate schools and exemption from taxation for public schools. This meant the re-establishment of the separate schools. This was an act of sovereign justice. To attack that bill was to strike down our schools and to attack the principle of separate schools.

"In the second place, the bill consecrated the principle of Federal intervention, since it gave effect to the judgment of the Privy Council, the highest court in the Empire, which declared that the rights and privileges of the Catholic minority of Manitoba had been violated by the laws of 1890.

"After asking in vain for justice from the Local Government, the minority finally asked the Federal Government to interfere. The Federal Government told the minority that the schools would be re-established. The judgment of the Privy Council was there and, relying upon the Constitution the Dominion Government said the principle of federal intervention would have to be recognized.

"However, we tried the impossible, to bend the Greenway Government. More than 600 of the Catholic minority went to the Greenway Government in a body and asked that their schools might be restored. The only reply was, 'We have nothing to do with you; you have no reason to complain.'

"You, yourselves, my brethren, petitioned. Then the Dominion Government asked the Provincial Government to restore us our schools. We thought they had exhausted all means to secure justice from the Local Government, which had refused to do its duty. The Catholics of the entire Dominion had sent up petitions, but all to no avail. There had been joy all through Manitoba when the Remedial Bill had been announced. It meant the freedom of educating our children as we saw fit and as became citizens of a free country. We said that it was a new era for us, and that we would gladly invite our relatives and friends to settle down in the Prairie Province. But unfortunately the Catholics had become divided among themselves when the bill came before Parliament. In face of that deplorable division, and the motives alleged to justify it, it is my duty to say that the bill was satisfactory with certain amendments, which could easily have been made.

"As Archbishop it was my duty to look after the religious part of the bill, and as to the legal part I consulted my clergy and men of law, both Protestants and Catholics. Among the latter were men whose children had been deprived of their schools, and who had a double interest in the matter. I received the assurance that from a legal point of view the law was both applicable and practicable. Therefore, I approve of the Remedial Bill, both from a religious and legal point of view. It is true that it is not perfect, since the Federal Parliament had only a remedial and not a creative power and had to follow the lines of the old school law. But to approve of the bill submitted did not mean to approve of its defects, some of which could be remedied while others could not without making it unconstitutional. The Bill was satisfactory as far as it went, and it was the duty of Catholic and right thinking Protestant members to vote for it, and try to make it better. Those members who voted for the law and then sought to improve it acted as loyal citizens in upholding the judgment of the imperial Privy Council and as good friends of the Manitoba minority, because they showed that they wished to do us justice.

"They say the Bill was not satisfactory. Very well, why did they not try to amend it? We found friends in both political parties who declared that they were Catholics above all. It has been claimed that the law only gave crumbs to the minority. The creation of a school board, appointment of inspectors, a Catholic normal school, formation of school districts, choice of books, exemption from taxation and the right to tax ourselves were not only crumbs.

"Is there nothing in Catholic schools but a question of money? Were not to be given the control of their schools? It is true that there had been no money voted, but this could have been done by an amendment after the principle of separate schools and Federal intervention had been approved of. This would have been a logical course.

"The true friends of the minority were the supporters of the bill. I will not refer to or speak of those members who voted against the bill. It is for you to judge them. But I believe it is my duty to tell you the truth.

"I see that my words will be abused, that I shall be violently attacked, but I have spoken and I am speaking because I am convinced of the truth of what I say. *Credidi propter quod locutus sum, ego autem humiliatus sum nimis.* I am convinced and I am ready to suffer for my convictions.

"Recently diatribes and insults have been flung at me, but that will not prevent me from speaking the truth. I have raised my voice for justice, and have been humiliated and insulted in English papers by statements which French papers would not dare to publish. My convictions will not be changed by such conduct, for insults do not effect the merits of the question.

"Insults do not matter to me. I know that I bear a terrible responsibility. As Archbishop of Manitoba I am the father and natural protector of the Catholic children of that province, and I mean to defend them as you would defend your own children. Those of our race who refused to

answer to our appeals when we raised our hands for help did an act which was applauded by the enemies of our race and our religion when they struck down the Bill which meant to extend justice to us and struck us to the heart.

"That is what I have to say about the Bill, and I say it without bitterness. I have no malice and no hatred at heart for any of my critics. I have none but kindly feelings to all the inhabitants of this great country, but my soul is sad and my heart is broken at the treatment which we have received. You, fathers of families, if the rights of your children were attacked, would not have voices strong enough to raise in their defence, and you would be right.'

"Now, what is it that we expect of you, my dear friends?

"The fact is that the minority have been deprived of their rights and the injustice ought to be remedied. The judgment of the Privy Council declared that the rights of the Catholics of Manitoba had been interfered with. There is no necessity for an investigation. The separate schools which existed previous to 1890 exist no longer. The Privy Council made the investigation before giving its judgment, and it is the highest court in the British Empire.

"We have been deprived of our schools. An injustice has been done and it ought to be remedied. The Local Government has refused to act, and nothing is to be expected from them. The Local Government has only lately gone to the country and got returned on the promise of continuing the persecution against us. How can they go back on their decision?

"We have the right to ask the Dominion Government to give us a law, NOT A COMPROMISE which could be broken at any time, BUT A LAW.

"At the time of Confederation the Protestant minority of Quebec obtained provisions in the law to protect themselves, and the Manitoba minority has a right to equally fair treatment.

"Why should the guarantee of the rights granted to Quebec be refused to Manitoba?

"Very dear friends, you wish to help us. Very well, ask the candidates if they will vote for a remedial bill. You must make sure of the leaders as well on this question, as they lead others. That is what the Catholic minority expects from the Catholics and right-thinking Protestants of the Dominion. That is my idea; I leave it to you to give it effect.

"You should pray the Blessed Virgin to enlighten the minds of all and to protect a small minority lost in the prairies of the West, which is vainly asking for justice. In so doing you will bring down the blessings of heaven upon your children. Pray to the Blessed Virgin to protect us in our hour of peril and to free Catholics from all political entanglements.

"Remember that your action in voting may have disastrous consequences if you are not wisely led. Beware lest by depriving your brethren in Manitoba of their rights, you should be the cause of your own children having to answer for your inconsiderate action.''

MGR. BEGIN AND THE REMEDIAL BILL.

He Approves of Its Principles.

ARCHBISHOP'S PALACE,
February 24th, 1896.

To the Editor, Morning Chronicle, Quebec.

DEAR SIR,—By order of His Grace the Archbishop of Cyrene, administrator of the archdiocese of Quebec, I beg to express his regret that the public journals have been apprised of certain statements which, by express agreement, were not destined for publication. In order to put an end to the different versions disseminated through the press regarding the answer given last Saturday to a certain delegation, His Grace deems proper to restore the accuracy necessary in so important a matter, of which some newspaper accounts are devoid. The following is the exact summary of what His Lordship said:

1. He had still to examine and study the text of the Remedial Order, and was, therefore, unable to express an opinion, but that, nevertheless, wishing to have as much light as possible thrown on the subject, he had already consulted able legists, untrammeled by political interests, and who do not consider the bill so defective as the gentlemen of the Opposition, and think IT WOULD BE WRONG NOT TO ACCEPT ITS PRINCIPLES.

2. That there had not been, and that there was not yet, a question amongst the bishops of framing a collective mandement, as the newspapers had announced. As to their future attitude in the matter, His Grace could affirm nothing, considering that his colleagues were widely scattered, and that he was not thoroughly acquainted with all their views. Probably, however, they would manifest their opinion later by some means of which Catholics should take account.

3. His Grace affirmed that he treated the school question not as a political but as a religious one, and that he had never consented, and was still unwilling to consent, to enlist in any political party, reserving to himself the right of judging the acts of either party according to their merits.

4. THE ARCHBISHOP CLAIMED FOR THE EPISCOPACY THE COMPETENCY REQUISITE TO JUDGE THE SCHOOL QUESTION, A COMPETENCY OF WHICH CERTAIN PERSONS WOULD LIKE TO DEPRIVE THEM.

5. He energetically inveighed against the Quebec organs of the Liberal party, which particularly of late, have been carrying on a work both unwholesome and ill boding, by making use of language most disrespectful to religious authority, which they are striving to undermine in the spirits of the people. He added that, though the bishops had not, so far, had the intention of promulgating a collective document on the school question, he, the Archbishop, personally, was on the point of writing a pastoral letter denouncing the above newspapers, their violent language and subversive ideas, if they do not alter their tone and attitude, proclaiming thereby, once again, the duties of the Catholic press, and putting the faithful on their guard against such dangerous publications.

I beg to remain,

Yours respectfully,

B. PH. GARNEAU, Priest,
Secretary.

Application of Catholic Doctrine

To the Manitoba School Question.

THREE RIVERS, May 17th, 1896.

His Grace Mgr. Laflèche followed the reading of the Bishops' collective letter with the sermon he had announced on the application of Catholic doctrine to the Manitoba school question. The sermon was attentively listened to and had a marked effect on the large congregation.

The Bishop took for his text the words of St. Paul to Timothy (2nd Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, chap. 4).

"*Praedica verbum, insta, opportune, importune, argue, obsecra, increpa in omni doctrina et patientia. Erit enim tempus cum sanam doctrinam non sustinebunt*

The apostle Paul addressed these words to Timothy, a bishop of the primitive church. He therein traces the duty of bishops in the matter of instruction. It is the duty of instruction that I have to-day to fulfil towards you.

You have just heard the collective letter of the bishops of the three ecclesiastical provinces of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa. It includes a doctrinal exposition of the duties of bishops during an election, inasmuch as it is itself an application of the duties of bishops. My duty towards you at this moment is to give you directions in a matter of importance, to distribute to you the doctrine that is contained in this letter.

Our Lord, preaching one day before a great multitude and seeing that they were hungry, ordered his apostles to give them bread. He blessed it, brake it, and bade his apostles distribute it to all the multitude. My brethren, that is what I am doing at this moment. I am going to distribute to you the bread of the Divine word. Last Sunday I explained the doctrine of the Catholic church with regard to education. To-day I must distribute to you bit by bit the bread given by the bishops in this letter to all the faithful in our province in order that you may understand this doctrine and conform your conduct to it.

In order that [illegible] may be received as it ought to be, do not look upon me as a citizen but as a Bishop. I do not wish [illegible] party. But as the [illegible] I am about to distribute to you the bread of the word of God. [illegible] made your [illegible] rise above human considerations [illegible] you [illegible] necessary to profit by the [illegible] you must [illegible] it [illegible]

In the application of the doctrine that I am about to make, I shall be obliged to descend to the level of facts, but in all this you are to look upon me as the man of God who studies the facts, not from the points of view of men, but from the point of view of the Holy Ground, in order to warn you against all error and place you on your guard against the traps set [illegible]

His Lordship then rapidly reviewed the explanation of Catholic doctrine with regard to [illegible] he had given the previous Sunday: the school ought to conform to nature, to divine law, and to constitutional law, which in our country respects the natural right of the parents and the right of the Church. Children are subject to the jurisdiction of their parents, who are bound to inculcate religious [illegible]

The debate which took place in Parliament last session on the Remedial Bill furnished the occasion to some to express opinions which are contrary to the teaching of the Church. The greatest of these errors is the error of liberalism. Mind, I am speaking of a religious error and not of a party. Liberalism gives the state the right of educating the child. This doctrine is false in every respect. It is not the mission of the state to educate or bring up the child.

His Lordship then condemned the teaching of Jean Jaques Rousseau in *Le Contrat Social*, that "the child belongs to the state before it belongs to the family," as subversive of moral right, and as having been applied in Manitoba and the cause of all the trouble. He said: It is the duty of the parents to bring up the child and the priest is to provide for its religious education. In matters of educa-

cation the state must second the efforts of the Church and favor its beneficial influence. The state must respect the faith and bringing up of the child, no matter to what religion it may belong.

The Bishop then gave a sketch of the history of Catholic schools in the North-west, which he had himself helped to establish as a missionary in the Red River settlement under Mgr. Provencher. He told how the funds for school purposes were divided among the different denominations, and showed the good feeling that prevailed between Catholics and Protestants. The schools continued to exist without any difficulty up to the entry of the present province of Manitoba into Confederation. The Act of Confederation was based upon a religious principle and respected the right of every man to bring up his children in accordance with his own belief. New provisions were extended to the Manitoba Act, which clearly stipulated for the right of the Catholics to separate schools. At Ottawa, when the Act was adopted a provision was inserted, which was in the opinion of its authors a special protection for the minority. At that time the majority were Catholics. To-day, unfortunately, they are in a great minority, but rights do not depend upon numbers.

His Grace then showed how separate schools were continued up to 1890, and how, when parties were equally divided, Mr. Greenway wanted Mgr. Tache to come to some understanding with him with reference to the entry of a French Minister into his Cabinet. In this connection he read the following extracts from an affidavit by the Rev. Father Allard, O.M.I.:—

"I distinctly remember that during the early part of the said year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, the Hon. Thos. Greenway, with whom I was not then personally acquainted, called at said episcopal residence in St. Boniface in the company of Mr. W. F. Alloway, whom I personally knew, and the said Mr. Alloway then introduced the said Hon Thos. Greenway to me, and the said Mr. Greenway then stated to me that he had called to see His Grace the Archbishop personally, touching a confidential matter. His Grace was then sick and confined to his bed, and I so informed the said Mr. Greenway and stated to him that, as the Vicar-General of His Grace, I could receive any confidential communications and communicate the same to His Grace; and I then assured him that he could rely upon my discretion in any confidential communication that he wished to make, and that His Grace the Archbishop would also respect his confidence.

"The Hon. Mr. Greenway then stated to me that he had been called to form a new government in this province, and that he was desirous to strengthen it by taking into his Cabinet one of the French member of the legislature, who would be agreeable to the Archbishop; whereupon I remarked that I did not think that His Grace would favor any French member joining the new administration unconditionally, and without any previous understanding as to certain questions of great importance to His Grace. Mr. Greenway replied that he had already talked the matter over with his friends, and that he (Mr. Greenway) was quite willing to guarantee, under his government, the maintenance of the then existing condition of matters with regard—

1. To separate Catholic schools.

2. To the official use of the French language.

3. To the French electoral divisions."

After stating that he received the assurances of Mr. Greenway on these three points and promised to convey the same to Mgr. Tache, the Rev. Father Allard continues:

"On the following morning, in pursuance of appointment, I attended at the office of Mr. Alloway in Winnipeg, and then, again, met the said Hon. Thos. Greenway, and I then communicated to him the message of His Grace so entrust to me as above set out, and Mr. Greenway then expressed to me his personal gratification at the said message and attitude of His Grace, and he then assured me that faith would be kept by his government with His Grace; and then again, in specific terms, repeated to me the assurance that

First—The Catholic separate schools;

Secondly—The official use of the French language;

Third—The number of French constituencies would not be disturbed during his administration."

I mention the case of Mr. Greenway, who violated, one after the other, all the promises he had made, to indicate the prudence you must display in the choice of candidates. They will promise you anything and everything. In face of such infamies, you ought to have regard to the antecedents of those who solicit your suffrages.

His Grace then traced the history of the question in its passage through the courts, the adoption of the Remedial order, and the presentation to Parliament of the Remedial Bill. He continued:—

The Bill is not perfect, no doubt, but it establishes a state of affairs which is bearable. Unfortunately it was made a political question. It is not a political question, but a religious question, which concerns the sacred rights of conscience. There are four kinds of schools: The Catholic School, where a full measure of religious education is given; the Protestant School, where more or less of it is given, according to the taste of parents; the atheistic school where God is put out of doors; and the neutral school, which is neither Catholic, Protestant nor atheistic, where religion is altogether unknown, and teachers are prohibited from teaching a word of it. This is the worst system of all, since it leads to indifference, which is the curse of the century. It is a system condemned by the Church, as you may conclude by the following quotation from a letter addressed by Pope XIII. to the Bishops of France:—

"In that which concerns the family, in the first place, it is of the utmost importance that from its cradle the child should receive sound religious instruction, and that the various courses of education which are to prepare it for life should never be separated from that of religion. To separate these courses of instruction from religion, is to aim at making childhood a blank with regard to the duties towards God—a system of education false in itself, and especially harmful in the case of young children, because it opens the door to atheism and closes it to religion.

"Christian parents then must take the greatest care that their children, as soon as they are old enough to understand, receive religious instruction, and that nothing in the schools can strike a blow at their faith and morals. The divine and natural laws enjoin this vigilance on parents, and they cannot for any reason be freed from this duty. The Church which protects and defends the integrity of the faith, which, in virtue of the authority it holds from God, its founder ought to claim the good will of Christian civilization of all nations, and which, therefore, ought to attentively watch over the instruction and education of children who are placed by baptism under its care—the Church has always formally 'condemned schools called mixed or neutral'; it has often times warned parents to be always watchful on this essential point. In obeying the Church on this point, you conduce at the same time to the welfare of society and forward the common interests. In fact those who have not been under the influence of religion in their early years have grown up without having any idea of the highest truths which can alone inspire men with the love of virtue and repress evil passions. Such are the ideas of God as a Creator, a Judge and Avenger, the rewards and punishments of the other life, the celestial aids which Jesus Christ offers us for the conscientious and devout fulfilment of our duties. Without that instruction, all cultivation of the intellect will be unhealthy. Young people freed from the fear of God cannot endure any of the rules on which a good life depends. Unable to restrain their passions in any way, they will be bound to give trouble to the State."

This is a formal condemnation of neutral schools. The child must always be under the jurisdiction of the father and of the Church to which he belongs. What we wish for ourselves in this respect we grant to others. Protestants have the right and duty, however mistaken they may be, of bringing up their children in accordance with their faith.

Protestantism is a purely religious error. Catholics have as the rule of faith the word of God, contained in the Scriptures and tradition, and infallibly interpreted by the church, by the general counsels and the Pope speaking "*ex-cathedra*."

Protestants have the word of God contained in the Scriptures, but interpretated by each man individually. Catholics have the fulness and certitude of religious truth. Protestants only have it in parts.

But right-thinking Protestants are Catholics, and apply the fundamental principles of Catholicism, in civil and political affairs. They recognize authority and without discussion submit to the constitution as a sovereign and infallible law as to facts, seeing that there is no superior authority to affirm it.

My brethren, this question of education is of capital importance and our Lord made it the base of his work of redemption when he said, "Man does not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceeded out of the mouth of God." The church holds to teaching frankly religious and Catholic. Many Protestants do not want schools without God, and that is why a great many of them unite with us to claim the right of religious instruction. In Manitoba, this right of religious education was trampled under foot. The money of the Catholics was taken away from them, they took the school houses which had been erected with their own money and then tried to force Catholic parents to send their children to Protestant schools. This was an outrage.

The Government of Manitoba refused to submit to the judgment of the Privy Council when called on to do so by the Federal Government, and to restore the Catholic schools. This same Government had promised not to interfere with separate schools. What spectacle we witnessed during the last session of the Federal Parliament? The Remedial Bill brought down the masks from the faces of many so-called Catholics. The check which this legislation underwent may bring good out of evil.

A French Canadian member, who styles himself a Catholic, and who is the recognized leader of a great party, made up of Catholics and Protestants, made the following declaration of principles as to his political conduct: "So long as I occupy a seat in this House, so long as I fill the post which I now do, on every occasion when it shall be my duty to take a stand upon any question whatever, that stand I shall not take from the point of view of Catholicism, not from the point of view of Protestantism, but I will be guided by motives which appeal to the consciences of all men, independent of their faith, motives which animate all men having justice, liberty and tolerance.' (Extract from Mr. Laurier's speech in the House in moving the six months' hoist of the Remedial Bill on March 3, 1889.)

This is the most outspoken declaration of Liberalism which has ever been made to my knowledge in a Legislative Assembly in this country. The man who speaks this language is a rationalistic Liberal. He formulates a doctrine which is entirely opposed to Catholic doctrine. It means that a Catholic is not required to be a Catholic in public life. This is a fundamental error which may be fraught with the most deplorable consequence.

Another member was asked:

"If Mgr. Langevin declares himself entirely satisfied with the Bill, and asks that it be passed, will the Conservative member support it?"

To which the member interrogated replied:

"The answer I have to give is this, Mgr. Langevin has fully the right of approving of the Bill under its religious aspect, but as a French Canadian I have the right to differ with him when the national and constitutional side of the question is under discussion. It does not belong to Mgr. Langevin to dictate to me my views and to say what I have to do with reference to the national, political and constitutional aspect of the Bill."

Here, the Church is put out of the question in a matter in which the very rights of conscience are at stake. Here is a member who gets up in face of the bishops and says to them straight: "You say that the Bill is acceptable; I say that it is not." Who is to be believed? Who has jurisdiction here to speak with authority? The member of Parliament says he has. This is pure Liberalism, that Liberalism which under the pretext that a religious question touches on politics on certain sides forbids the religious authority to intervene. Listen, my brethren, to the refutation of that error in the pastoral letter of the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Quebec dated September 22nd, 1895:

"Are these questions in which the bishop and the priest can, and even some-

times ought to interfere in the name of religion?

"We answer without hesitation: 'Yes, there are political questions in which the clergy can and ought to interfere in the name of religion. The rule of this right and duty is to be found in the distinction between the Church and the State we have already pointed out.'

"These are, indeed, political questions which affect the spiritual interests of souls, either because they relate to faith or morality, or because they may affect the liberty, independence or existence of the Church, even when looked at from the temporal point of view.

"A candidate may present himself whose programme is hostile to the Church, or whose antecedents are such that his candidature is threatening to its interests.

"In the same way a political party may be judged dangerous, not only because of its programme and antecedents, but because of the programme and individual antecedents of its leaders, of its principal members and of its press, if the party does not disavow them and definitely separate itself from them in case they persist in their error after being warned of it.

"In these cases, can a Catholic, without denying his faith and showing hostility to the Church of which he is a member, refuse to the Church the right to defend itself, or rather to defend the spiritual interests of the souls entrusted to it? But the Church speaks, acts and fights through its clergy, and to refuse these rights to the clergy is to refuse them to the Church.

"Then the priest and the Bishop can in all justice and ought in all conscience to raise their voices, to point out the danger, to declare with authority that to vote in such a way is a sin, that to do such an act exposes a man to the censure of the Church. They can and ought to speak not only to the electors and the candidates, but even to the constituted authorities, for the duty of every man who wishes to save his soul is traced by Divine law; and the Church, as a good mother, owes to all her children, of what rank, love, and therefore spiritual watchfulness. The pulpit is not converted into a political platform when the conscience of the faithful is enlightened on all the questions in which their salvation is concerned.

"It is evident that, from the nature of the question, to the Church alone ought to belong the right of deciding the circumstances under which it ought to raise its voice on behalf of Christian faith and morality.

"It is my duty to give you a solemn warning, and I do not wish to fail in doing so, since on the fulfilment of this duty depends the salvation of my soul or death to the souls confided to my care. The principles invoked by these two men are diametrically opposed to Catholic teaching. I speak here of doctrine, and not of party. Here is what the Holy Father Pope Leo XIII. says on that point:—

"Others do not go quite so far, but they are not consistent. According to them, Divine laws ought to regulate the life and conduct of individuals, but not of States; it is permitted in public affairs to disobey the orders of God and to legislate without paying attention to them; whence springs the pernicious consequence of 'the separation of Church and State.'"

To make of man two different beings, one a Catholic in private life, the other a Liberal in public life, is an error, a monstrous and most dangerous error. You will vote shortly. Here are two men whose deadly errors I signalize to you. This is the first time that I have seen such a categorical formulation of rationalism in the mouth of a Canadian.

After quoting from Mgr. de Segur, to show that Catholics, no matter what their position, must submit to the Church in religious matters, His Lordship said: This is the Catholic doctrine, and here is a warning which, in consequence, I feel bound to give you; under the circumstances, a Catholic cannot, without committing a grievous sin, vote for the leader of a party who has formulated such an error so publicly or for the partisans, which support him in such an error, so long as they have not publicly repudiated this erroneous doctrine and taken the solemn pledge of voting for a remedial law accepted by the Bishops.

This is a question of the very highest importance. If children are brought up in godless schools they become revolu-

monists. You find the fruits of godless education in the assassinations from which the chiefs of States cannot defend themselves. Having referred to the assassination of President Carnot as an instance of this, he continued:

The first instruction which I have to give to the Catholics of this diocese for the coming elections, is to give their votes only in favor of candidates who will pledge themselves to vote in favor of a Remedial Bill accepted by the Bishops. Do not forget that this vote will be of the greatest importance. My second instruction is to entreat you to lay aside all party feeling, no matter what it may be, and to judge men and events from the point of view of Catholic principles and Catholic teaching only. This you will do courageously, as Catholics, as Canadians and as citizens, and the good God will bless your efforts and will permit you to find here below a taste of the happiness which He reserves to His elect.

MGR. O'BRIEN'S LETTER

He Denounces the Laurier Commission an a Subterfuge and an Injustice.

The Acts of the Government Speak Louder than the Doubtful Motives of the Liberals.

The *Antigonish Casket* publishes the following important letter from Mgr. O'Brien, Archbishop of Halifax, on the Manitoba school question:—

On my arrival here from the East a few days ago, I learned from the reports of Parliament, as well as from newspapers, the fate of the Remedial Bill. I need scarcely say it was a surprise to me as well as a subject of regret. So strong was my faith in the good sense of my countrymen and in their spirit of loyalty to our peerless constitution, to say nothing of their love of fair play, that I felt it would be an insult to doubt the practical unanimity of the House in upholding that constitution, and in deciding once forever that in Canada there is as little room for religious firebrands as there is little use for political tricksters. The noble action of the Commons, on two previous occasions, had amply warranted this belief. Who could have imagined that public men, in Canada, both within and without Parliament, should have turned a purely constitutional question into a partisan one, or should have sought to perpetuate an admitted injustice at the risk of an era of senseless sectarian strife, and of national retrogression. The worst enemy of our country is the sower of religious discord and of racial enmity. There is no place in our public life for such a one. He should be bound in a sheaf with the prophets of pessimism, and the would-be betrayers of our country, and trampled under foot on the threshing floor of public opinion.

A plain question is before the people of Canada. Shall we, or shall we not, stand by our constitution which ensures the rights of all, but only inasmuch as they are guaranteed to each? Or shall we, by striking at the rights of a few, be the motive what it may, weaken the safeguards of our own, engender a spirit of mutual distrust, and fan into a flame the fast expiring embers of former unworthy dissensions? Only a desperate professional politician could be guilty of such a crime against the social well-being of our fair country. An honest man, it is true, who dislikes the idea of separate schools, might, for a moment, be tempted to pursue such a course of action, looking at the question from one point of view only; but on reflection he would recognize that it is not whether or not there shall be separate schools, but whether the Constitution shall be observed to-day in regard to the rights of Smith, so that it may be invoked to-morrow to support those of Brown. Our rights must stand or fall together. Few, I trust, have any desire to infringe on those of their fellow-countrymen. Our enlightened sense of true liberty, as well as the conditions of our national life, would render impossible the gratification of such desire.

Having lately passed through various countries, and having attentively observed their social condition, the superiority of our own Canada, as a home of peace and plenty, has been more fully than ever impressed on my mind. And yet,

we are only at the starting point of our course. Mutual trust, mutual respect for the convictions of others, a little bearing and forbearing, with a loyal devotion to the Constitution, even when it may run counter to some fad of our own, will ensure to Canada the future, in great part at least, of the world. It is simply wonderful what she has accomplished during the past twenty-five years. History affordsno parallel to it. Grecian or Roman legends of mythical greatness do not equal the sober facts of our short career. The vigorous spirit that breathes life and hope and national aspirations into the blood and brain of young Canadians has exorcised, or at least silenced, the voice of the annexationist, and has created a bond of union between all races and religions in the pursuit of national progress.

An insidious attempt is now made to break that unity, and, although this may not be intended, the consequence will be to bring back that wilderness of discord and national disruption in which the cry of union, with or rather subjection so, the neighboring Republic will be heard again; and who can say with what effect?

In a crisis like the present no lover of his country can keep silence. Would that my voice could reach the ears and the intelligence of all my countrymen. To non-Catholics I would say:—Are you, the descendants of men who won, after a long and hard fight, constitutional liberty, going to inflict a blow, which must have far-reaching consequences, on the work of your fathers? If you do not uphold the Constitution now, your action will one day be invoked as a precedent for breaking it on some other point,—it may be against yourselves. In your hands rest the future peace and advancement of the Dominion. You are a majority; you can oppress a poor minority in a certain province; you can say, we reck not the decisions of courts, nor the claims of good faith and fair play; you can evoke an evil spirit, and implant a rankling feeling of injustice in the hearts of very many of your countrymen; you can stay the wheels of progress, and blight the fair prospects of our loved country. You can do all this by voting against remedial legislation. That any considerable percentage of you will do this, I, who have been nurtured in your midst, refuse to believe.

I know it will be said: "We do not refuse to right any wrong that can be shown to exist; but we wish first to investigate, to ascertain if any hardship has been inflicted on a minority." To an outsider this appears reasonable; to a Canadian it is what I scarcely wish to characterize, lest I should be accused of using violent language. No man at all conversant with public affairs can be unaware of the injustice practiced against the minority in Manitoba. It is a subject for sorrow and humiliation that anyone should ignore this injustice; it is a hollow pretence to talk of investigating it; it is treason against conscience to plead this wretched excuse to justify opposition to its abolition. We may add, it is an insult to non-Catholics to suppose that any appreciable number of them will allow a difference of religious belief to blind them to the dictates of ordinary justice; or that they can be made the puppets of a movement which must end, if successful now, either in surrender to the claims of the minority, which is probably contemplated by the leaders, or in disaster to the country.

I trust, sir, you were mistaken in supposing any Catholics in Halifax "lent countenance to an appeal to anti-Catholic prejudice." Some of them, indeed, may dislike the present Government, and might on a question of trade or other policy, bitterly oppose it; but in common with their non-Catholic fellow-citizens who are not blinded by fanaticism, they will surely be on the side of justice, even should they doubt the motive of the Government in acting justly. We are to look at acts, not motives. The former fall under our cognizance; the latter are seen and judged by God alone. True Catholics in Halifax, as elsewhere, will not learn their duty, nor the ethics of political action, from party politicians, Catholic or non-Catholic, but from purer and less interested sources, viz., from the principles of justice, which are binding on all men at all times. No party triumph, no worldly consideration, no ties of association can excuse an act of injustice.

† C. O'BRIEN.

Rome, May 6th, 1896.

BISHOP CAMERON OF ANTIGONISH

Says a Liberal Vote is a Vote against Justice.

AN IMPORTANT LETTER.

Bishop Cameron, of Antigonish, Nova Scotia, has issued the following circular letter to the clergy of his diocese —

"We are on the eve of a general election, on the result of which largely depends the peace and prosperity of Canada. A burning question, the importance of which far exceeds all others now agitating political parties, was raised six years ago in Manitoba by the tyrannical action of the Local Government. This question has since been occupying public opinion, growing in intensity, and continuing to remain a cause of dissension as long as it is not finally settled on a just basis. It is upon this question that an appeal is made to the electorate of the Dominion so that they may give a conscientious vote on the 23rd instant. The position for each of us is the following: Will you elect on that day representatives ready to support a leader who has promised to have the Constitution respected, and to remedy for all time the harm which has been done to sap the very basis of our most cherished rights? Or will you on the contrary, choose men who are bound to uphold another leader who is practically opposed to a remedial law intended to redress admitted grievances of a most serious nature?

"During the last session of the Federal Parliament we saw our great political parties divided on the subject of remedial legislation; one of them trying in the most vigorous manner to have a bill adopted which was sincerely approved of by the Catholic minority of Manitoba; the other opposing the measure, and denouncing it as a measure of coercion and succeeding by their violent resistance to render its adoption impossible under the circumstances.

"Now, provided the present leader of the Government be sustained by a majority at the end of this month, when Parliament meets, the struggle will be again renewed on remedial legislation and this time it will be won. A lesson will, therefore, be given to fanatics and extremists, to dishonest politicians who will not again dare to trample the constitution under foot to oppress minorities, Catholic or Protestant, in any part of our beloved country.

"On the other hand if the partisans of the Government are even in number with those of the Opposition, and the more so if they are in a minority, the majority will remain with the partisans of Mr. Laurier and Mr. McCarthy, united to the Patron candidates and the duty of submitting a remedial measure to the House will rest with Mr. Laurier. Is it probable that Mr. Laurier will do his duty? Has he not on several occasions opposed the Government's remedial measure as being a measure of coercion and a violation of the rights of the provinces? It is true that Mr. Laurier has promised on different occasions that once he is Prime Minister he will induce the Greenway Government to modify the law of 1890, concerning separate schools so as to give the dissatisfied minority full satisfaction, but will this attempt, if made, be crowned with success? Is it probable that the Government, which only lately gave Mr. McCarthy the ovation we are all aware of, and which is doing all in its power to have [illegible] by its friends at Brandon, is disposed to submit to the appeals of Mr. Laurier?

"Is it advisable to think that the Greenway Government, after having, with a purely sectarian purpose, entertained and cherished for the past six years a spirit of unchained hostility towards separate Catholic schools, will run towards its political death by admitting its faults and ask its fanaticized dupes to continue their confidence in a Government of impostors? Never. But there is still another reason why the plan of the leader of the Government is doomed to failure.

"In a letter lately received by me from the Archbishop of St. Boniface, he wrote as follows:

"'Past experience, and the circumstances which surrounded the last local elections, and the well-founded opinions of men worthy of belief, Catholics, as well as Protestants, authorize me to state that we will never obtain separate schools from the Greenway Government, and that all arrangements made in Winnipeg will necessarily be incomplete and precarious. Our only salvation is in a Federal remedial bill settling the question permanently and placing us under shelter, or cover from the attacks of fanatics and the capricious ambition of political parties. The remedial bill, amended during the last session at Ottawa, was sufficient, and it could have been rendered perfect by other amendments in committee, and this is what the so-called friends of the Manitoba minority should have done. By voting against the law, they did the work of our worst enemies. It is, therefore, my opinion that we should rally to those leaders, and those only on whose flag is inscribed Remedial Legislation. In consequence I entreat Your Grace and all your people to support only candidates determined to give us in our hour of need (what we ask for in the name of liberty and reason) as well as in the name of the constitution. We hope that all Catholics, together with sincere men of other denominations, will stand by us to have the Federal agreement respected. May the All-Powerful God, in His infinite mercy, enable us to establish freely the reign of Jesus Christ in the souls of the dear children confided to our care. We turn our eyes to Heaven from which support will come in opportune time.'

"Wanting in sincerity, and hard-hearted would be the Catholic or non-Catholic who would close his ear to such a sincere and reasonable appeal. But the fact that the persecuted minority are of our religion and that they are struggling to recover the free use of their heritage and divine duty of bringing up their children in their faith is another reason which compels us to consider ourselves as doubly obliged in conscience to uphold the constitution by voting only for candidates determined to support the brave leader who has pledged himself by his reiterated declarations made in the most formal manner in Parliament, and in the public meetings from Manitoba to Cape Breton, to submit and have adopted by Parliament a Federal remedial law approved of by competent authority, that is to say the aggrieved Manitoba minority.

"TO VOTE FOR A LIBERAL IN THE PRESENT CRISIS IS IN REALITY TO VOTE AGAINST THE JUSTICE WHICH MUST BE RENDERED TO THE MANITOBA MINORITY. THE LEADER OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY BEING THE ONLY ONE WHO HAS PLEDGED HIMSELF TO RENDER JUSTICE, EVERY ELECTOR, WHO BY HIS VOTE, DIMINISHES HIS EFFECTIVE MAJORITY, WILL THEREBY DECREASE HIS CHANCES OF BEING CAPABLE OF SUBMITTING TO AND HAVING ADOPTED BY PARLIAMENT, THE MEASURE IN QUESTION."

"You can use this circular according to your own judgment.

Corpus Christi Day, 1896.
(Signed), JOHN CAMERON,
Bishop of Antigonish.

Mgr. Rogers and the Remedial Bill.

The *Moniteur Acadien*, the organ of the French Catholic population of the Maritime Provinces, in March last gave the opinion of the Bishop of Chatham, Archbishop Rogers, on the Remedial Bill. It said:—

"On Monday last the St. John newspapers published certain words spoken the evening before at his procathedral, and reported that His Grace had nothing to say on the Manitoba school question.

"The Bishop wished to contradict this statement. Three days two Student-Fathers had an interview with Mgr. Rogers as to the possibility of the establishment of a house in his diocese. In the case the St. Michael College, which has been closed for twenty years, could re-open its

classes, and in mentioning the fact to his Chatham flock, Monseigneur said that if there were school difficulties elsewhere, they had themselves also interests to safeguard in the matter of education.

"In his letter, Mgr. Rogers declares that if he had to express an opinion on the Manitoba school question, 'he would strongly approve of the adoption by the Dominion Government of a Remedial Bill.' He had signed a petition asking the Government to do justice to the minority which had been robbed of its dearest rights."

BISHOP GRAVEL'S TESTIMONY.

He Says the Bishops of the Whole Dominion are Unanimously in Favor of the Bill.

The following is an extract from a sermon delivered at St. Angele de Laval on May 28th, 1896, by Mgr. Gravel, Bishop of Nicolet:—

"The school question must not be lost sight of, for it is of the utmost importance. It is a question of patriotism and of religion, a question of justice; it is for that reason that the Bishops sent their mandement to their flocks. Politicians may be interested in seeing this question disappear from the political arena, and more than one would like to get rid of it. But we Bishops, who have been charged to protect the spiritual interests of the faithful confided to our care, we shall not give the question up until it is settled on the basis of justice.

"IT MUST NOT BE BELIEVED THAT THE BISHOPS ARE DIVIDED ON THIS QUESTION. ALL THE BISHOPS OF THE DOMINION HAVE ONLY ONE AND THE SAME THOUGHT. THEY ARE UNANIMOUS.

"The Bishops of Ontario have met at Kingston, and have instructed their clergy to this effect. The Bishops of the Province of Quebec have met at Montreal, where they drew up the mandement which has been read to you. The Bishops of the Maritime Provinces have also given directions to their clergy. Mgr. O'Brien, who is at Rome, recognizes the importance of the question so clearly that he has sent a letter, in which he appeals not only to Catholics, but also to Protestants, for their help in the equitable settlement of this question

"A venerable bishop of Upper Canada said to Mgr. Langevin: 'If we have the happiness of seeing this question equitably settled, we will go with you and sing a solemn *Te Deum* in gratitude to God. Henceforward we will do all in our power to help you to arrive at this happy results.'

"YOU SEE THAT ALL THE BISHOPS HAVE THE SAME DESIRE AND ANXIETY TO SEE THIS QUESTION SETTLED AND THAT THEY ARE UNANIMOUS.

'Even if the bishops had not spoken, your duty would be, nevertheless, to vote judiciously and for a candidate offering sufficient guarantees. You must vote for a candidate who will render full and entire justice to the Catholics of Manitoba. Their right to Catholic schools is perfectly established. The schools must be restored."

THE BISHOP OF RIMOUSKI

Bears witness to the Feeling of the Ontario Bishops.

His Grace Mgr. Blais, Bishop of Rimouski, has addressed the following letter to Mr. Geo. P. Roy, Conservative candidate in the County of Bonaventure :

RIMOUSKI, June 5th, 1896.

To MR. G. P. ROY,

St. Laurent de Metapedia,

My Dear Sir,

In response to your letter of the 1st inst., I beg to say that it has never been proved to me that Mr. Fauvel " with the authority of the clergy of the diocese of Rimouski," voted against the Remedial Bill, which was asked for and accepted by the bishops. It has never been demonstrated to me that any of the priests of my diocese have fallen so far short of their duty and their dignity.

I know perfectly well, that during my absence in Rome last winter my authorized representative, the administrator of this diocese, twice asked and pressed Mr. Fauvel to vote for the Remedial Bill then submitted to the House of Commons, and that Mr. Fauvel did not think it his duty to follow that guidance.

As to the attitude taken by Mgr. the Bishop of Three Rivers, in his own cathedral, as to the collective mandement of the Bishops on the Manitoba school question, canonical rules oblige me to say that he was within his right. The venerable prelate had the incontestable right of giving such comments or explanations as he deemed necessary or convenient with respect to this important document, of which he was one of the authors.

Priests were enjoined to communicate it without comment from the pulpit, but this law, made by the Bishops for their subordinates, could not bind the Bishops themselves. They remained judges of the opportuneness of interpreting their mandement according to the needs of their dioceses.

Moreover, it is absolutely false to say that Bishops of Ontario have criticized, contradicted and ridiculed the sermon of Mgr. Lafleche, explaining the collective mandement of the Bishops; and in telling you this, I may say that I draw my information from the highest authority.

Praying God to keep you in His Holy care.

I remain,

My dear Sir,

Your obedient Servant in

Our Lord.

ANDRE ALBERT,

Bishop of St. German de Rimouski.

Mgr. Fabre and the School Question.

Extract from a circular from Mgr. Fabre to his clergy, under date 15th April, 1895

II. MANITOBA SCHOOL.

In asking you to keep silence on the Manitoba school question, my intention was that you should not speak from the pulpit. With this exception, however, you are free to express the entire satisfaction of the Canadian episcopate with the firm and courageous attitude recently taken by the Dominion Government.

This is only doing justice to the good will of our legislators, and encouraging them to pursue to the end the work so happily begun.

I remain, very sincerely, dear fellow believers,

Your devoted servant in
Our Lord,

EDWARD CH.,
Archbishop of Montreal

ANOTHER LIBERAL LIE.

Telegram from Mgr. Walsh.

Several times the Liberal papers endeavored to use the name of Mgr. Walsh against the policy of the Government on the school question.

In March last the *Electeur* published the following despatch from Toronto:

"TORONTO, 10th March.

"I am in a position to state that His Grace Mgr. Walsh, Archbishop of Toronto and Metropolitan of Ontario, has informed the Hon. Mr. Laurier that he endorses his policy on the school question. I may say also that at the request of the hierarchy, Sir Oliver Mowat has adopted the resolutions that you know of. They ask it from him as a service to the Catholic cause."

This lie of the *Electeur's* has been categorically denied as follows:

"The Toronto despatch to *L'Electeur* regarding my attitude on Manitoba school question is an audacious falsehood.

"ARCHBISHOP WALSH."

The *Electeur* remained quiet for some time; but on Thursday, May 28th, it again attempted to exploit the name of Mgr. Walsh. Hoping to produce a great public sensation, it announced that the Rev. Father Minehan had the preceding Sunday, while preaching in the Toronto cathedral, in presence of the Archbishop, condemned the sermon of Mgr. Lafleche, his declarations and his doctrines. The Liberal paper had the impudence to insinuate that he made these statements with the approbation of Mgr. Walsh.

The Archbishop of Toronto again intervened and gave yet another denial to the *Electeur*. The following is the despatch which he sent to the Hon. T. C. Casgrain:

"TORONTO, Ont., May 29, 1896.

"Hon. Thos. Chase Casgrain,
Quebec.

"Give the *Electeur's* version of the Father Minehan affair the most formal and emphatic denial. Father Minehan is pastor of a small suburban church and his utterances were made without my knowledge and have received my condemnation."

(Signed) JOHN WALSH,
"Archbishop of Toronto.

Further comment is unnecessary.